

### REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 13 through 25, 38 through 45, 49, 50, 63 through 75, 83, 98 through 103, 108 through 111, 113 through 116, 121 through 124, 126 through 129, 134 through 137, and 139 through 174 are pending, with Claims 13, 38, 39, 40, 41, 63, 64, 65, 66, 83, 139, 156, and 172 being independent. Claims 38 through 50, 63 through 75, 83, 85 through 99, 104 through 125, and 130 through 174 were allowed. Claims 20 and 140 were objected to and indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants have respectfully maintained said claims in dependent form, as Applicants earnestly believe that the claims from which they depend will be found allowable. Claims 46 through 48, 85 through 97, 104 through 107, 112, 117 through 120, 125, 130 through 133, and 138 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 13, 23, 24, 38, 83, 139, 156, and 172 have been amended.

Applicants gratefully wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended in granting and conducting on January 12, 2004, a personal interview with Applicants' representative. At the interview, Applicants' representative and the Examiner discussed the outstanding rejections, which are respectfully traversed, as well as proposed amendments to the claims.

As discussed at the interview, it will be appreciated that, inter alia, Claims 13, 38, 83, 139, 156, and 172 have been amended to recite that --an exposure amount applied by said first exposure means to the predetermined exposure region is less than a permissible

exposure amount--. Applicants respectfully submit that said recitation, while it does not appear in haec verba in the specification, nonetheless finds support in, e.g., Figs. 4, 12, 25, 28, and 29. Applicants note that in those drawings, the "IMAGE ON WAFER" in "FINE (LINE) EXPOSURE" and the desired pattern shape (i.e., the shape of the mask) should be compared with each other; in the "FINE (LINE) EXPOSURE", an image of a mask pattern is transferred to a wafer; clearly, this exposure is carried out with an exposure amount less than the permissible exposure amount; if the exposure amount applied to the wafer is greater than the permissible exposure amount, the "image" given to the wafer would be directly printed on the wafer by a subsequent development process. In more detail, Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to the first embodiment shown in Fig. 4, wherein a pattern (desired pattern) which is going to be printed has a shape such as a gate chart shape shown in Fig. 3 (see, e.g., pp. 35-37), and this shape is the same as the mask shown in Fig. 4; when the wafer is exposed by "FINE EXPOSURE", a pattern as shown at "IMAGE ON WAFER" is photoprinted on the wafer; here, if the exposure amount provided by the fine exposure is larger than the permissible exposure amount, the result would be that a plurality of longitudinal lines having narrow linewidth would be printed on the wafer (this means that a visible pattern will remain on the wafer after development); therefore, in that case, the shape of the pattern thus produced would not be the desired shape; clearly, this means that the exposure amount provided by the "FINE EXPOSURE" is less than the permissible exposure amount in this example; hence, in the present invention, "FINE EXPOSURE" of an exposure amount less than the permissible exposure amount is carried out superposedly with "COARSE

EXPOSURE” and a desired pattern shape such as a gate chart shape is obtainable. Favorable consideration as to the foregoing is earnestly solicited.

Claims 13 through 19, 21 through 25, 100 through 103, 126 through 129 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,259,513 B1 (Gallatin, et al.). Claims 139 and 141 through 155 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Gallatin, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,908,656 (Suwa, et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed at the interview, Claim 13 recites, inter alia, illuminating the predetermined mask with light of the predetermined wavelength under a second mask-illumination condition, different from the first mask-illumination condition (used for illuminating the predetermined mask), to superposedly print a second pattern on the predetermined exposure region where the first pattern has been printed.

Claim 139 recites, inter alia, illuminating the predetermined mask with light of the predetermined wavelength under a second mask-illumination condition, to print a second pattern on the predetermined exposure region, wherein exposures with the first and second exposure means (the first exposure means illuminating the predetermined mask) are carried out simultaneously and so as to superposedly print the first pattern and the second pattern on the predetermined exposure region.

However, as discussed at the interview, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Gallatin, et al. nor Suwa, et al., even in combination, assuming, arguendo, that such could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed combinations of claimed features as recited, inter alia, in Claims 13 and 139. In this regard, Applicants respectfully

note that Gallatin, et al. shows, e.g., that the illumination regions 26, 28, 30, and 32 spatially correspond to pattern regions 52, 54, 56, and 58 (e.g., col 4., lines 3-5), which Applicants respectfully submit is not “superposed” as claimed. Meanwhile, Applicants respectfully submit that Suwa, et al. is silent as to illuminating the predetermined mask superposedly and under different illumination conditions as recited in the above-discussed features of Claim 13 and to illuminating the predetermined mask superposedly simultaneously as recited in the above-discussed features of Claim 139. It is further respectfully submitted that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at such claimed features.


The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Further, as discussed at the interview, Applicants respectfully wish to direct the Examiner’s attention to U.S. Patent No. 5,863,712 (Von Bunau, et al.), which was cited in the April 30, 2002 Information Disclosure Statement. Applicant respectfully notes that Von Bunau, et al. discloses, e.g., a multiple exposure process using a single mask; however, Applicants respectfully submits that the claims are allowable over said patent because said patent fails to disclose that the exposure amount applied by the first exposure means to the predetermined exposure region is less than a permissible exposure amount.

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Daniel S. Glueck", is written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicants  
Daniel S. Glueck  
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200  
DSG

DC\_MAIN 153540v1